



# Flood Control District of Maricopa County

## Flood Control Advisory Board

### Meeting Minutes for October 24, 2007

**Board Members Present:** DeWayne Justice, Chairman; Scott Ward; Kent Cooper; Ray Acuña, Ex Officio; Hemant Patel, Secretary; Melvin Martin, Vice Chairman; Tom Sands

**Board Members Absent:** Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio

**Staff Members Present:** Timothy S. Phillips, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager; Geraldine Roll, General Counsel; Larry Lambert, Greg Jones, Tom Loomis, Amir Motamedi, Linda Mardian, Joe Tram, Don Rerick, Tom Renckly, Doug Williams, Linda Reinbold and Anna Medina, Clerk of the Flood Control Advisory Board

**Guests Present:** Paul Driver, City of Phoenix; Gary Flynn; Scott Strosnider, City of Scottsdale; Sheila Hughes, City of Chandler; Hasan Mushtaq, City of Phoenix; David Lopez, Aspen Consulting; Teri George, Cimarron; Jennifer Gagnon, HDR; Jason Kelly, City of Scottsdale; Scott Snyder, City of Scottsdale

1) CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Justice called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 24, 2007.

2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3) APPROVE THE MINUTES OF September 26, 2007

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Martin to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

4) ELECTION OF FCAB OFFICERS

Presentation given by: Timothy S. Phillips

PURPOSE: The Flood Control Advisory Board bylaws state that officers shall be elected by the members to serve a one-year term from November to October. Based on general rotation, the slate of officers for the period November 2007 to October 2008 would be:

Chairman  
Melvin Martin

Vice Chairman  
Hemant Patel

Secretary  
Kent Cooper

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Patel and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

5) APPOINTMENT OF FCAB STANDING COMMITTEES FOR 07/08

Presentation given by: Timothy S. Phillips

PURPOSE: In accordance with Article VI, Section 1 of the Flood Control Advisory Board bylaws, the Standing Committees shall be Legislative, Program and Budget, Policy and Public Information. Recommendations are as follows:

Legislative Committee

Paul Cherrington

Kent Cooper

Program & Budget Committee

Melvin Martin

Hemant Patel

Policy Committee

Ray Acuña

Hemant Patel

Public Information Committee

DeWayne Justice

Scott Ward

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Patel to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

6) PHOENIX DETENTION BASIN DAM NO.7

Presentation given by: Tom Renckly, P.E., Dam Safety Branch Manager

PURPOSE: Action item to determine whether the Flood Control Advisory Board should endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors approve IGA FCD2007A012 between the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) and the City of Phoenix (City) for cost sharing and implementation of; design, construction and construction management of the Phoenix Detention Basin No.7 Dam Rehabilitation Project (Project).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Cooper asked, you say you haven't hired an engineer to do any of this design work for this project, is that correct? You've got \$200,000 that went to design. Mr. Renckly responded that the City of Phoenix, on their own, is going ahead and has started the procurement of the design contract. They have that design contract on board. The IGA indicates that as long as the IGA is approved and they do work in this fiscal year, then the District can fund under the IGA. But they understand it's subject to the approval of the IGA. The design work has not been initiated. The intention would be that the design work would be done this FY. That's the City of Phoenix contract. Mr. Cooper said he was just wanting some direction on how there is a public meeting in which you announce how much is for construction, how much is for design, [inaudible] person whose proposal should know what the budget is. It just seems like a million-dollar project with 20 percent design cost seems pretty excessive for construction that's already built. We're not designing a structure from scratch, like a new building or

something which can be done for 10 percent. I just want some clarification. Mr. Renckly said that's a good question. I think the basic answer is that on dam rehabs you never really know what you're going to find and so I'm sure there's some contingencies in there. It is not unusual to have a dam rehab with a non-construction cost running 35 percent of the total cost or 50 percent of the total cost. Mr. Renckly continued by saying this is fairly straightforward, so I know it's hard to believe, but 20 percent is rather low for a dam rehab. Will we use all that? I don't know. I think the City of Phoenix current scope of work is something less than that, around \$140,000-\$150,000, so there is some contingency. Mr. Martin asked if there were other questions. Mr. Acuña said Mr. Chairman, Tom, how many homes are located downstream of this structure? Do we know? Mr. Renckly answered, Ray, I don't have a number on that. I don't know if the City of Phoenix has that or not. Mr. Acuña said I believe that this structure has been given a notice of deficiency by ADWR. Mr. Renckly responded that I believe that deficiency was for an emergency action plan that now has been developed. I don't recall if there was a specific deficiency on the trees or not. Mike has indicated there was. Mr. Acuña asked if this investment will address both that deficiency identified by a state agency and insure protection of close to 3,000 homes downstream. Mr. Renckly said that's correct, Ray. It basically brings the dam to current dam safety standards in order to protect those homes. And that is the nature of a dam – it's a double-edged sword. It provides the benefits of flood protection, but also you have to make sure that a [inaudible] operates safely. Mr. Acuña said okay. Mr. Martin asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Martin replied that he had one, too. He asked if the contract, design contracts [inaudible] \$140,000, why are we putting 20 in? Mr. Renckly responded that our experience with the regulator is that design costs will go up as you move through the design process. I think the design concept took the design to about 15 percent. The regulator typically has a lot that they will look at for us to do during the design process. So a contingency there based on experience working with ADWR is a very good idea to have.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Patel to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously

7) FISCAL YEAR 08/09 (CIP) PRIORITIZATION PROCEDURE RESULTS

Presentation given by: Amir Motamedi, Hydrology/Hydraulics Branch Manager

PURPOSE: Information Only, No Action Required. Staff will present preliminary results and staff recommendations for the FY 08/09 CIP Prioritization Procedure.

## DISCUSSION:

### **Scottsdale Granite Reef Wash Watershed Flood Mitigation**

#### **Questions from the Board:**

Mr. Cooper said it appears like this one project pretty much consumes a large part of the budget. Is there a reason why there isn't a 50/50 share? Mr. Motamedi said Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cooper, that's a good question. It is a large budget item, however, considering the fact that there are so many homes, and residential and commercial areas that will benefit from this, the scoring criteria allowed for it to be recommended. Of course it is a large budget item, so therefore it could be phased in different sections or portions as we go through and that's part of the negotiation in the future. Mr. Cooper asked about the 50/50, the variation on the 50/50 [inaudible], why is that? Mr. Phillips responded by saying Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cooper, the request had the cost share that Amir identified. We still look for a 50/50 cost share, and as we go through negotiation and resolution IGAs, we will be looking toward going to the 50/50. But at this point, what Amir told you was how it was requested by the City of Scottsdale. But our endorsement of it and the scoring criteria takes into account what is proposed as far as the cost share. But at this point, the IGA is really the final answer in what the cost share would be. Mr. Cooper said it does impact by having this large an amount dedicated to one project. Mr. Phillips said keep in mind that the prioritization process generates the list of potential projects that will be factored into the CIP, subject to available funding and cost share and timing. At this point, dollar-wise it's not competing for those dollars directly, it's competing for a place on the list that says this is a viable project, subject to the next step which will be resolution and IGA development. So approval of this at this time, or next month or December when you see it, doesn't mean that we have committed that cost share and those dollars into the five-year budget. It is subject to the IGA negotiations. Mr. Ward said Mr. Chairman, Amir, tell me why this is needed. Mr. Motamedi said Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ward, the part of the drainage area, you're correct, is to the east of the Loop 101 and that was cut off when the freeway was put in. However, the drainage area to the north of this is large enough to still provide enough water for the floodplain to remain as it is. We did look at it four years ago and we verified that this floodplain is just about as large as before. So yes, it has helped it, but it has not eliminated the floodplain. Mr. Ward asked if other options have been looked at in this area, maybe buying houses and creating retention areas? Mr. Motamedi said, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ward, about two or three years ago the Flood Control District completed a study for this area on its own and we came up with several alternatives. I don't believe buying the houses was one of the options. There were several other alternatives that we looked at. None of them was feasible, mainly because the outflow from this area goes to the Salt River/Pima/Maricopa Indian community. To provide for an outlet in that direction was not working. So we did not come up with a recommended solution at that level. The City of Scottsdale looked at it on their own and I cannot answer

you specifically about buying homes, because there's 1,000-plus structures. It may have been more expensive than this solution at this point. Mr. Ward asked if the area is in a floodplain. Mr. Motamedi said yes, that is correct. This area is in the floodplain. Mr. Ward asked if it was in the floodplain when it was originally platted. Mr. Motamedi said I don't know that. I was going to mention this at the end, but Mr. Chairman, there are representatives from Scottsdale present here, so if I cannot answer any of the questions, maybe they can also step in, if they can provide you with those answers. The first floodplains were about 1977 or 1979 when the maps were published. I'm pretty sure some of this area precedes the development. Mr. Ward asked if we have any slides showing what happens during the storm in the inundation area? Mr. Motamedi answered that I'm sure there are some. I personally have been out there after some storms, and between McKellips and McDowell I witnessed water in the streets and some of the homes, so I know that there is some actual flooding. Have all of the homes been flooded? Probably not, but there is a flooding problem in that area. Mr. Ward said I've got to make a comment. Looking at our annual CIP budget, if my numbers are correct, we're looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of \$25 million of our budget into this project. I was in a hearing prior to the meeting, but I'm sure you discussed that the secondary property taxes were reduced and we're going to see less funds for the CIP program. I'm sure you guys have weighed this, because Scottsdale is a good client city, but somebody is taking half or a quarter of our annual CIP budget for property that's been in the floodplain for 30 years, which is going to inhibit us from doing flood control measures in other areas of town. I'd like to know why, priority-wise, why is this a priority? Mr. Motamedi said that in terms of our recommendation, this is a request by the City of Scottsdale and we follow the existing criteria, but I don't believe at this point we have put it as a priority ahead of any other projects, we're just saying this is a worthy project. Of the 12 projects, we're recommending five of them based on those criteria. Mr. Ward said that given the dollar amount, I would like Scottsdale to come up and tell us the history – just tell us about this project, if you would. Mr. Snyder said my name is Scott Snyder and this is Jason Kelly. I'm with the City of Scottsdale. Mr. Ward asked if this has always been in a floodplain or was something built that changed the watercourse. Mr. Snyder answered that the floodplain you see up there right now was mapped by FEMA in 1984 and that was based on pre-Loop 101 flow numbers. The flood zone has been deserted by FEMA. And the flood zone that was established by the Flood Control District is actually slightly different than the one mapped by FEMA and there are actually structures that may be inundated now that were not mapped by FEMA. The Flood Control District actually mapped a slightly higher number and so the City of Scottsdale feels that it is a priority to remove these structures from the flood zone. There may be some houses out there that may be inundated by flooding that they don't know yet, and we feel that it's our duty to protect not only those structures but all the structures that are in the flood zone. Mr. Kelly added that the City of Scottsdale's really standing on the shoulders of the study that the District had done in 1997 and 2001. The '97 study evaluated the floodplain which was actually slightly bigger than the

regulatory. The floodplain that's defined by FEMA right now is from 1,500 cfs (cubic feet per second). The study showed that with the up-to-date methodology evaluation that the District had done it was more like 2,200 to 2,600 cfs. It went from Thomas down to McKellips. So right now they're in a situation where the floodplain, the regulatory floodplain, is actually smaller than what is probably true for the area, and the study that the District has come up with showed that there were over 1,000 structures in the floodplain, including mobile homes from the Indian community down to McKellips. At the time, though, there were no real outfalls. Amir said there's no outfall because the water runs through Section 12 into an existing irrigation tail water that just spreads out. Because of the IGA that's in place with the Indian community, ADOT and the City of Scottsdale that studied Pima Road all the way and looping around into Curry Road in Section 12, they're interested in developing all that area from Section 12 and along the freeway. It became evident that if we could just upsize the drainage instead of just taking care of roadway flows under a widened Pima Road, we would be able to have a flood control facility to take care of stormwaters and take all the people out of the floodplain. So it presents a solution that wasn't there before when the District studied it, and we've collaborated with the District in terms of evaluating to this point and in fact the District has done a courtesy review of the hydrology and the analysis that we've done. Mr. Ward said he had a couple of questions. Amir, take that pointer, if you will, and show us the area that's developed there now. Mr. Motamedi asked if he should show the area developed within the watershed. Mr. Ward said yes. Mr. Motamedi showed the area. Mr. Ward asked if it is the area in the red. Mr. Motamedi said no, the area in the red [inaudible] alternative storm waters. This is the floodplain. I don't know if you can see that from where you're at, and the drainage area [inaudible]. Mr. Ward said okay, how many homes and what's the value of the property in the area? Mr. Motamedi said there are 1,053 structures we have found, and I guess I don't know the value of the homes. Mr. Ward said, well, that's okay. Mr. Kelly said the regulatory floodplain that's shown just extends to the historical wash. It used to go up in the McDowell Mountains and pass through the Indian lands and across the freeway. But actually, if you'll look at the District study, there's a lot of water coming down through the neighborhoods all the way from the Arizona Canal to the [inaudible] regulatory floodplain. The value in flood insurance alone would be over a million dollars a year besides the savings of blight and property. And even in a small event, because of the accumulation of the flows through the neighborhoods, even in regular storms, two-year to five-year storms, they experience damage in the southern parts. And I would add that on McKellips Road, the Department of Transportation and the county have built a box culvert and updated a sizeable box culvert area because they've had fatalities, I think at least one, maybe two, due to hydroplaning across McKellips Road. And then ultimately there are benefits to the Indian community in terms of being able to provide areas for residences in Section 12. The floodplain spreads out through Section 12 because there is no channelization. Mr. Ward said it looks like we're solving the hydraulic issue for Section 12, so now it's waiting for development.,

Is there a way for the Indian community to reimburse us for the impact fee or an agreement to help subsidize some of this, because suddenly they get a section of land that doesn't have the historic flows that were channelized and passed around the site. Mr. Kelly said I think it's an ancillary benefit, really, and part of it is that the facility does pass through Indian community land beginning just north of McKellips Road. Allowing the facility to pass through to the Salt River will be part of an IGA between the City of Scottsdale and the District. Mr. Ward agreed that it's a tremendous benefit knowing how aggressive the Indian community is in development. It's a prime location for office, retail and hotels. And the City of Scottsdale and Maricopa County, I think, is offering a tremendous benefit for the Indian community. Is there some way, Tim, that – I'm all for public safety – is there some way that you might get some reimbursement from the Indian community? Mr. Phillips said, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ward, I think that's within the realm of possibility. My discussion with the community manager out there that I've known for years suggested that they're finally to a point where they're looking to develop Section 12. It's all [inaudible] lands, which makes it difficult to do. His feeling is now is the time for us to initiate the discussions about how to deal with getting across the Indian community property, and certainly part of that discussion would be to leverage dollars for benefits. Both Scottsdale and the District would certainly look to leverage as best we can the Indian community to come to the table based on the benefit that they would receive. Mr. Ward responded that the Indian community doesn't pay property tax and they don't pay sales tax to the county or the city. Mr. Phillips said that's true. Mr. Ward concluded that those are his questions. Mr. Patel said I have one other. Is there any other driver for the project – is this part of a roadway project along Pima? Mr. Kelly said that one of the main drivers for this project is Pima Road is currently being [inaudible] to expand and there isn't an IGA in place with the Indian community. They're going to have to put drainage in Pima Road when they redo it, so while it's going up, why not. Mr. Patel asked what the timeline is for that project – within the next five years? Mr. Kelly said they don't have a concrete timeline. It is just in the preliminary stages. Mr. Cooper asked if the Scottsdale representatives understood the concerns the board has about the request in terms of percentages or 50/50 cost share. Mr. Kelly said yes, we understand that. We leveraged all the problems that we have and that is what we came up with the shortfall, but this project benefits Scottsdale, the Indian community, and we have Loop 101 and ADOT, we've got McKellips and [inaudible]. We are looking to find leverage funding for all of that, so 17 percent is what the City of Scottsdale was able to leverage out of [inaudible]. Mr. Martin said I'm sure you can hear our concerns, and as a matter of fact, I thought it was at 50/50, maybe I assumed that then. Regarding how you broke out the score at 69, I think before it comes back to us, you need to break that down. Thank you very much.

## **Chandler Project**

### **Questions from the Board:**

Ms. Hughes: My name is Sheila Hughes. I'm the acting city engineer for the City of Chandler. Mr. Ward said I just wanted to take a moment and thank Ms. Hughes for the 50/50 cost share. Ms. Hughes answered that we certainly appreciate the opportunity to submit this project. I think it's key to our downtown re-development in areas in which we have had historic flooding. It's an area that was filled prior to a lot of our existing technical design manuals coming into play that requires our [inaudible] Chandler now requires for all the development. The area we've been retrofitting and improving over time was a series of projects that kind of complete out an area that will deal a lot with our residents and their development in the area, so we appreciate the opportunity to submit this and look forward to working with you. Mr. Martin said thank you and asked for questions.

## **Northern Parkway and Dysart Road Channel**

### **Questions from the Board:**

Mr. Ward said I have one question. Again, how many homes/residences, Amir, do you remember? Mr. Motamedi said this is a pretty recent photo from September 2007. It doesn't show that many homes right now, but I believe there is some [inaudible] treatment plant and a kennel for Luke Air Force Base in that area.

## **20th Avenue and Turney Retention Basin**

### **Questions from the Board:**

Mr. Driver said we have approximately 70 recurring flooding complaints in this area. This is an old area of the Cave Creek Wash. It was a former floodplain that was centered up on 21st Avenue right there and there are small low-income houses on that side of the street that flood repeatedly, so we're very interested in this project. It's going to be long term, probably phased. We're going to need a new bond program, I think, with our cost share, but we've already purchased the land. We're planning on doing some remedial work within the basin itself just for a one-acre parkway project and we anticipate having to purchase some additional property on that site because we need 40 acre feet of retention volume somewhere on the site to be able to get 10-year protection. Mr. Ward asked for confirmation, to get 10-year protection? Mr. Driver said yes, I think the problem is we really have no place to put the water. This is along the Grand Canal, a considerable distance from the Salt River and we have old two-year storm drains, and I think that storm drain at 19th Avenue is 1971 vintage, and it's small – 40-inch going by there, covering a big drainage area a mile wide in an old Cave Creek wash floodplain. So this facility is really needed to protect the canal from overflows



and also to protect multi-family housing in the area and single-family housing in the area that floods because the canal's banks are slightly higher in the surrounding area. Mr. Martin asked if there were other comments. There were none, and he said okay, thank you.

### **Las Haciendas Drainage Improvement Project**

#### **Questions from the Board:**

Mr. Driver said we have eight properties that flood. When I was out there two years ago during August 2, 2005 storm, eight properties flooded in the location. I said that was a gigantic storm, like a 25- or 50-year storm that hit there, something that's going to be a pretty rare event. And then last year they flooded again, so we did a study and this is the bare minimum that they're going to need to have protection in that area for a 10-year storm. I apologize, we're actually at this point debating after we submitted it for the prioritization procedure, possibly doing a little more with this area. We think we need to re-channel the 42nd Street wash, so we might be headed into that, too. We haven't decided yet if we're going to come to the District for assistance for that, but we're at least going to start with this small project and see if we can't mitigate this area. People are kind of upset.

No Action Required

#### **8) FEMA's POLICY FOR LEVEE RECERTIFICATION**

Presentation given by: Tim Murphy, Flood Delineation Branch Manager

PURPOSE: Information Only, No Action Required. Staff will provide information on FEMA's policy for recertification of levees.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Ward asked if Mr. Murphy could go back to the last map. Mr. Ward said it looks like the 101 freeway system is part of the levy system in Maricopa County. He asked, am I detecting that – are freeways levies? Mr. Murphy said Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ward, freeways could be considered levies, but I don't think in this particular instance the 101 that crosses the north part of town is being shown as a levy. I think it's just a color distortion. We tried to make sure that the levies really stood out well on this map, because some of them are fairly small and you wouldn't be able to see them so we really over-emphasized the size of them. Mr. Ward said thank you. Mr. Cooper said I guess I'm a little confused. When I first came to Arizona in 1983, I noticed our good friends at SRP had some canals running through the community, like the Eastern Canal, and they showed up on the map as levies. I didn't see the RWCD canal, which parallels those two other canals and similar in size, but I'm just curious why the RWCD canal wasn't on there. I used to be a little perturbed at SRP because what they would do every year on their canal cleanup is they would just pull the debris out of the

canals and a lot of [inaudible] sediment, and they would build the roads up along the sides of the canal with that dirt. And so the road would be higher and higher. There was more and more of a barrier over time, so the actual canal elevation of the water is basically at grade, but you've got some big mounds on both sides of the canals running through the community which would certainly meet the criteria of a levy. I don't think SRP ever intended that these things would be levies, and I used to complain, asked them to go knock your levies down because you're creating a bigger flood for the property adjacent to your canal. You're acting irresponsibly. I don't know if they liked that message or not, but I think it was accurate in terms of the higher you built that, the more water it can hold and create flooding problems. As the owner of these levies, SRP may not want to certify it as a levy. They can go in there any day and just take those roads down to grade, I suppose – get rid of the levy. I don't think SRP thinks of themselves as being in the flood control business. I'm picking on you, but Tim probably has the answer. Mr. Murphy said Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cooper, members of the board, I'd be happy to address both of those questions. As far as the RWCD not being shown, that's one of the things that we noticed as we went through looking at these maps. There are a lot of inconsistencies. The Arizona Canal is actually still shown with the levy symbol, even though we built the ACDC right upstream of it. So while it sort of technically still meets that definition because it's a raised embankment, it at least meets part of the definition, our thought is that's not right or that shouldn't be shown as a levy because it's not acting as a levy any more because we've got a big channel on the upstream side of it. Mr. Phillips: added that would be also the same argument for the RWCD canal that has the East Maricopa Floodway on the upstream side. Mr. Murphy said in some cases maybe somebody went through and cleaned them up before and in some cases maybe not, so that might be one of the benefits of this whole process. A lot of these inconsistencies are going to get cleaned up. As far as the canals actually being levies, or functioning like levies, our suspicion at this point is that most of these owners of canals and railroad embankments and things like that don't want to be in the flood control business and aren't really interested in having these embankments certified as levies. So, one of the things that we're going to have to really work on with FEMA is if it's a map-certified levy, what is the condition of the floodplain with that structure in place and what's the floodplain with the structure not in place. So, how do you properly show a floodplain without those particular structures in place? One of the things we want to stay away from is taking out the big broad brush and just painting the whole downstream area as in a floodplain. We don't want to do that. If we're going to have to show a downstream floodplain, we want to have some sound reasoning, something that we can actually defend to people and say this is why we put some sort of downstream floodplain below these structures.

No Action Required

9) FY 2008 YTD SEPTEMBER ENDING

Presentation given by: Linda Mardian, Financial Business Analyst

PURPOSE: Information Only, No Action Required. Staff will provide an update report detailing the District's FY 2008 September Ending Financial Performance.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Ward asked Ms. Mardian to go back to a slide. He said where it says total funds available again, is that essentially money we have in the bank that we're earning one and a half percent interest on? Ms. Mardian said that's correct. Those are funds that we have with the treasurer's office. Mr. Ward said okay, and was it available for you at any time for general ledger needs or CIPs? Ms. Mardian said yes, and at the treasurer's office they have it under operating and capital, so we have two separate funds. So if for some reason we were going to have a large expenditure for the CIP, then I would move funds from operating to the CIP. Mr. Ward asked how are you seeing costs out there in the market? In terms of materials and trades, or anybody you do business with in terms of market conditions. Are they getting worse, have they stabilized? Have the commodities come down for you guys? Ms. Mardian said I really can't answer that. Maybe Tim or Don could tell you on construction. Mr. Rerick answered Chairman, Mr. Ward, I can't answer specifically. I can tell you that the last three bids we opened were remarkably favorable to us. If you would like, we could run some numbers for some comparison purposes for information the next time that we see you in December. Mr. Ward said I'd just be curious to see for my personal information how it's affecting you guys as market conditions get more favorable for the guys that are building projects. Mr. Rerick said we could do that. We could pull together last year's engineer's estimates against low bid openings and put that in a table for you. Mr. Ward asked for pipe, concrete, and asphalt figures. Mr. Rerick said we can do that as well. We can break down the primary bid items. We typically bid our concrete in linear foot, sometimes cubic yards. So you're not getting a true representation of that cubic yard cost, but we can give you some comparisons. Mr. Ward said I'm just curious to get an idea, two percent, three percent, just what you're seeing. That'd be great.

No Action Required.

10) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Mr. Phillips said Mr. Chairman, for Item 10, I don't have any comments this month, only to say that the next meeting is December 5 and that'll be the combination November/December board meeting. And that's typically what we do each year. Do you have any comments?

No Action Required.

11) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

No additional comments were made.

12) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS

No additional comments were made.

*The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.*